



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/844,925	04/26/2001	Richard Mark Levenberg	PALM-3542.US.P	8281
49637	7590	05/16/2006	EXAMINER	
BERRY & ASSOCIATES P.C. 9255 SUNSET BOULEVARD SUITE 810 LOS ANGELES, CA 90069				SHINGLES, KRISTIE D
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2141		

DATE MAILED: 05/16/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/844,925	LEVENBERG, RICHARD MARK
	Examiner Kristie Shingles	Art Unit 2141

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 February 2006.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment
Applicant has no amended claims.

Claims 1-21 are pending.

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed 2/24/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

A. Regarding claims 1, 9 and 18, Applicant argues that the cited prior art *Huang* (US 2002/0133569), *Li et al* (US 6,345,279) and *Hawkins* (US 2001/0032254) fail to teach the claimed limitation for “a sequence of textual references to images that are directly adjoining”.

A.1. Examiner respectfully disagrees. *Huang*'s teaching of transcoding web page data into a standardized form and then modifying the data for display on the client device describes items that appear on a web page, wherein transcoding involves text descriptions of the items that appear on the web page and transformation rules that specify how to transform the items into a standardized format and then modify them for display on the client device (pages 1-2 paragraphs 0013-0014, page 3 paragraphs 0033-0038, page 4 paragraph 0041). The text descriptions of items that appear on a web page constitute textual references to images that are directly adjoining, because these items are images that are apart of the layout of the webpage and are incorporated into the webpage template in order to form a composite image on a website. Furthermore, *Hawkins* teaches the formatting of data objects that render text-referenced images, thereby generating a composite image for display on the wireless client device (pages 30-31

paragraphs 0248-0250, TagImage Table page 22, INPUT Table page 26, IMG Table page 29).

Applicant's arguments are therefore unpersuasive and the rejections under *Huang, Li et al* and *Hawkins* are maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. **Claims 1, 2, 6, 8** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Huang et al* (US 2002/0133569) in view of *Li et al* (US 6,345,279).

a. **Per claim 1**, *Huang et al* teach a method for transcoding web-page content for a limited-display computing device comprising the steps of:

a) upon receiving a web page request from a limited-display computing device, sending the web page request to a server computer that contains the requested web page document [paragraphs 0012 and 0026-0027; user's web page requests are received from a wireless device and sent to a web server via a proxy server];

b) receiving from said server computer a web page document that can be used to generate a display [paragraphs 0027-0030; adapter receives web page from web server for conversion and transcoding into a displayable format for the wireless device];

c) searching said web page document for sequences of textual references to images that are directly adjoining [Fig. 2D-4 and paragraphs 0033-0038; textual references from the web page are examined to dictate the order or the images and content];

d) when said web page document includes a sequence of textual references to images that are directly adjoining, rendering each of the images represented by

said textual references that are directly adjoining so as to generate a composite image [Fig.2D-4 and paragraphs 0033-0038; renderings of items and content by textual references generate composite images of the web content]; and

f) sending each composite image scaled in step e) to said limited-display computing device [Abstract and 0013; upon application of transcoding rules and modification the transformed web content is sent to the portable, wireless device].

Although *Huang et al* teach transcoding rules along with modification of the extracted data in order for display on portable, wireless device [Abstract and paragraphs 0012-0013]; yet *Huang et al* fail to explicitly teach scaling each composite image rendered in step d) to meet the display requirements of said limited-display computing device. However, *Li et al* teach customizing transcoded content for client devices, wherein the content is appropriately sized for the client device (col.1 lines 24-42, col.2 lines 53-62, col.5 line 27-col.6 line 48). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of *Huang et al* and *Li et al* for the purpose of customizing the composite image for display on the limited-display computing device—in particular, scaling or sizing the image based on the screen size on the display of the limited-display computing device; because it provides content to limited-display computing devices in a form that allows the devices to properly render the image.

b. **Per claim 2,** *Huang et al* and *Li et al* teach the method of Claim 1, *Huang et al* further teach wherein said web page document is written in a Hypertext Markup Language (HTML) [paragraphs 0036-0037].

c. **Per claim 6,** *Huang et al* and *Li et al* teach the method as recited in Claim 1, *Huang et al* further teach wherein said images rendered in step d) are rendered to an image size corresponding to the image size of a full-size display screen [paragraphs 0010-0012].

d. **Per claims 8, *Huang et al* and *Li et al* teach the method as described in Claim 1, *Huang et al* further teach wherein said limited-display computing device is selected from the group consisting of handheld computing device, a mobile phone, a pager, and an Internet appliance [paragraphs 0026-0027; *Li et al*: col.6 lines 17-19].**

4. **Claims 3-5, 9-11, 13-15 and 17-20** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Huang et al* (US 2002/0133569) in view of *Li et al* (US 6,345,279) and *Hawkins* (US 2001/0032254).

a. **Per claim 3, *Huang et al* teach the limitation of claim 2 as applied above, but fail to teach the method of claim 2 wherein said sequence of textual references to images are directly adjoining vertically. However, *Hawkins* teaches vertical alignment and adjoining of images referenced by text [TagImage Table pg. 22, INPUT Table pg.26, IMG Table pg.29].**

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of *Huang et al* and *Li et al* with *Hawkins* to adjoin text references vertically for the purpose of providing optional arrangement or organization and for support of various alignments. One skilled in the art would have been motivated to generate the claimed invention with a reasonable expectation of success.

b. **Per claim 4, *Huang et al* and *Li et al* teach the limitations of claim 1 as applied above, but fail to teach the method of claim 1 wherein step d) further comprises: d1) when said web page document includes a formatting object that includes a plurality of textual references to images, rendering each of the images represented by a textual references to an image that is disposed in said formatting object so as to generate a composite image. However, *Hawkins***

teaches the formatting of data objects rendering text-referenced images and generating a composite image for display on the wireless device [paragraphs 0208-0210 and 0248-0250].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the systems of *Huang et al* and *Li et al* with *Hawkins* in order to provide for the conversion processing, scaling, and rendering of formatting objects, for the purpose of extending the method's capabilities to other types of formats supported by web pages and not just text only. One skilled in the art would have been motivated to generate the claimed invention with a reasonable expectation of success.

c. **Per claim 5**, *Huang et al* and *Li et al* teach the limitations of claim 1 as applied above, but fail to teach the method as recited in Claim 1 wherein step e) further includes reducing the bit depth of said composite image to meet the display requirements of said limited-display computing device. However, *Hawkins* teaches conversion to a bit depth compatible with the display of the wireless device [paragraphs 0085 and 0172].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the systems of *Huang et al* and *Li et al* with *Hawkins* to reduce the bit depth of the original composite image for the purpose of rendering a version of the image that's scaled and compatible with the display requirements of the wireless device.

d. **Claims 9 and 18** contain limitations substantially equivalent to the limitations of claims 1 and 4, and therefore are rejected under the same basis.

e. **Claims 10 and 19** contain limitations substantially similar to the limitations of claim 2, and therefore are rejected under the same basis.

f. **Claim 14** contains limitations substantially similar to the limitations of claim 5, and therefore is rejected under the same basis.

g. **Claim 15** contains limitations substantially similar to the limitations of claim 6, and therefore is rejected under the same basis.

h. **Claim 17** contains limitations substantially similar to the limitations of claim 8, and therefore is rejected under the same basis.

i. **Per claim 13,** *Huang et al* and *Li et al* with *Hawkins* teach the method of claim 9 wherein step d) further comprises: *Hawkins* further teach d1) when said web page document includes a sequence of textual references to images that are directly adjoining, rendering each of the images represented by said textual references that are directly adjoining so as to generate a composite image [Fig.2D-4 and 0033-0038; renderings of items and content by textual references generate composite images of the web content].

j. **Per claims 11 and 20,** *Huang et al* and *Li et al* teach the limitations claims 10 and 19 as applied above, but fails to teach the method of claims 10 and 19 wherein said formatting object is a table. However, *Hawkins* teaches the use of a table [0115 and TagTable pg.20-21].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the systems of *Huang et al* and *Li et al* with *Hawkins* in order to provide for the conversion processing, scaling, and rendering of formatting objects such as tables, for the purpose of extending the method's capabilities to other types of formats supported by web pages and not just text only. One skilled in the art would have been motivated to generate the claimed invention with a reasonable expectation of success.

5. **Claims 7, 16, 12 and 21** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Huang et al* (US 2002/0133569) in view of *Li et al* (USPN 6,345,279) and further in view of *Robotham et al* (US 6,704,024).

a. **Per claim 7**, *Huang et al* and *Li et al* teach the limitations of claim 6 as applied above, but fail to teach the method as recited in Claim 6 wherein all of said web page document except said images rendered in step d) are transcoded using a normal transcoding process and are sent in step f) to said limited-display computing device. However, *Robotham et al* teach using a transcoding process as applied only to text [col.5 lines 1-35].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of *Huang et al* and *Li et al* with *Robotham et al* to transcode web content except for images for the purpose of using other alternative encoding rules that are more efficient for encoding images. One skilled in the art would have been motivated to generate the claimed invention with a reasonable expectation of success.

b. **Claim 16** contains limitations substantially similar to the limitations of claim 7, and is therefore rejected under the same basis.

c. **Per claim 12**, *Huang et al* and *Li et al* teach the limitations of claim 10 as applied above, but fail to teach the method of Claim 10 wherein said formatting object is a frame. However, *Robotham et al* teach making use of frame and implementing a frame-buffer [col.9 lines 4-16 and col.19 lines 37-60].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of *Huang et al* and *Li et al* with *Robotham et al* to provide for the conversion processing, scaling, and rendering of formatting objects such as

frames, for the purpose of extending the method's capabilities to other types of formats supported by web pages and not just text only.

d. **Claim 21** has limitations substantially similar to the limitations of claim 12, and is therefore rejected under the same basis.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: *Crosby et al* (US 6,870,547), *Jackelen* (US 6,930,791), *Miller et al* (US 6,947,990), *Gao* (US 6,581,094), *Vetro et al* (US 6,542,546).

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kristie Shingles whose telephone number is 571-272-3888. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:30-6:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on 571-272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kristie Shingles
Examiner
Art Unit 2141

kds



JASON CARDONE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER